arXiv:1401.7809v1 [hep-ph] 30 Jan 2014

The Bound-State β^-–Decay of the Neutron Revisited

A. N. Ivanov,[1,*] M. Pitschmann,[1] N. I. Troitskaya,[2] and Ya. A. Berdnikov[2]

[1]*Atominstitut, Technische Universität Wien, Stadionalle 2, A-1020 Wien, Austria*

[2]*State Polytechnic University of St. Petersburg, Polytechnicheskaya 29, 195251, Russian Federation*

(Dated: January 31, 2014)

We calculate the branching ratio and angular distributions of hydrogen of the bound–state β^-–decay of the neutron, induced by left–handed and right–handed hadronic and leptonic currents. The branching ratio of the bound–state β^-–decay is calculated by taking into account radiative corrections. We show that the bound-state β^-–decay can be hardly a good laboratory for experimental investigations of electroweak models with left–right symmetries.

PACS numbers: 12.15.Ff, 13.15.+g, 23.40.Bw, 26.65.+t

I. INTRODUCTION

In Ref. [1] the bound-state β^-–decay of the neutron $n \to {\rm H} + \bar{\nu}_e$, where H is hydrogen, has been revised by taking into account the new value of the axial coupling constant $\lambda = -1.2750(9)$ [2, 3] as well as new effective scalar and tensor weak lepton–nucleon interactions. The amplitude of the continuum-state β^-–decay of the neutron, calculated in the rest frame of the neutron in the non–relativistic approximation for the proton, including radiative corrections by virtual one–γ, W and Z–boson exchanges as well as QCD corrections [4–12], is given by [3]

$$\begin{aligned}
M(n \to p e^- \bar{\nu}_e) = &- 2 m_n \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} V_{ud} \Big\{ [\varphi^\dagger_p \varphi_n][\bar{u}_e \gamma^0 (C_V + \bar{C}_V \gamma^5) v_{\bar{\nu}_e}] \Big(1 + \frac{\alpha}{2\pi} f_{\beta^-_c}(E_e, \mu) \Big) \\
&- [\varphi^\dagger_p \vec{\sigma}\, \varphi_n] \cdot [\bar{u}_e \vec{\gamma}\, (\bar{C}_A + C_A \gamma^5) v_{\bar{\nu}_e}] \Big(1 + \frac{\alpha}{2\pi} f_{\beta^-_c}(E_e, \mu) \Big) + [\varphi^\dagger_p \varphi_n][\bar{u}_e (C_S + \bar{C}_S \gamma^5) v_{\bar{\nu}_e}] \\
&+ [\varphi^\dagger_p \vec{\sigma}\, \varphi_n] \cdot [\bar{u}_e \gamma^0 \vec{\gamma}\, (\bar{C}_T + C_T \gamma^5) v_{\bar{\nu}_e}] - \frac{\alpha}{2\pi} g_F(E_e)\, [\varphi^\dagger_p \varphi_n][\bar{u}_e\, (1 - \gamma^5) v_{\bar{\nu}_e}] \\
&+ \frac{\alpha}{2\pi} \lambda\, g_F(E_e) [\varphi^\dagger_p \vec{\sigma}\, \varphi_n] \cdot [\bar{u}_e \gamma^0 \vec{\gamma}\, (1 - \gamma^5) v_{\bar{\nu}_e}] \Big\}, \qquad (1)
\end{aligned}$$

where the coupling constants C_j and $\bar{C}_j$ for $j = V$, A, S and T describe effective weak interactions [13–15], which may be induced by left–handed and right–handed hadronic and leptonic currents (see also [3]) caused by interactions beyond the Standard model (SM) such as supersymmetric interactions [16] and so on. They are related to the coupling constants, analogous to those which were introduced by Herczeg [17], as follows (see also Eq. (2) in Appendix G of Ref. [3])

$$C_V \; = \; 1 + a^h_{LL} + a^h_{LR} + a^h_{RR} + a^h_{RL},$$

*Electronic address: ivanov@kph.tuwien.ac.at

$$
\begin{aligned}
\bar{C}_V &= -1 - a^h_{LL} - a^h_{LR} + a^h_{RR} + a^h_{RL},\\
C_A &= -\lambda + a^h_{LL} - a^h_{LR} + a^h_{RR} - a^h_{RL},\\
\bar{C}_A &= \lambda - a^h_{LL} + a^h_{LR} + a^h_{RR} - a^h_{RL},\\
C_S &= A^h_{LL} + A^h_{LR} + A^h_{RR} + A^h_{RL},\\
\bar{C}_S &= -A^h_{LL} - A^h_{LR} + A^h_{RR} + A^h_{RL},\\
C_T &= 2(\alpha^h_{LL} + \alpha^h_{RR}),\\
\bar{C}_T &= 2(-\alpha^h_{LL} + \alpha^h_{RR}),
\end{aligned}
\tag{2}
$$

where the index h means that the coupling constants are introduced at the *hadronic* level [3] but not at the *quark* level as it was done by Herczeg [17]. In addition, in comparison with Herczeg [17] we have taken away the common factor $G_F V_{ud}/\sqrt{2}$ and defined the coupling constants a^h_{LL} and a^h_{LR} as deviations from the coupling constants of the SM.[1] The SM weak interactions are defined by coupling constants $C_V = -\bar{C}_V = 1$, $C_A = -\bar{C}_A = -\lambda$ and $C_S = \bar{C}_S = C_T = \bar{C}_T = 0$. The functions $f_{\beta^-_c}(E_e,\mu)$ and $g_F(E_e)$ in Eq. (1) are equal to [3]

$$
\begin{aligned}
f_{\beta^-_c}(E_e,\mu) &= \frac{3}{2}\,\ell n\Big(\frac{m_p}{m_e}\Big) - \frac{11}{8} + \ell n\Big(\frac{\mu}{m_e}\Big)\Big[\frac{1}{\beta}\,\ell n\Big(\frac{1+\beta}{1-\beta}\Big) - 2\Big] + \frac{1}{\beta}\,L\Big(\frac{2\beta}{1+\beta}\Big)\\
&\quad -\frac{1}{4\beta}\,\ell n^2\Big(\frac{1+\beta}{1-\beta}\Big) + \frac{1}{2\beta}\,\ell n\Big(\frac{1+\beta}{1-\beta}\Big) + C_{WZ},\\
g_F(E_e) &= \frac{\sqrt{1-\beta^2}}{2\beta}\,\ell n\Big(\frac{1+\beta}{1-\beta}\Big),
\end{aligned}
\tag{3}
$$

where m_p and m_e are the proton and electron masses, μ is a finite-photon mass regularisation parameter for the regularisation of infrared divergences in virtual one–photon exchanges [4–12] (see also [3]), $\alpha = 1/137.036$ is the fine–structure constant [18], $\beta = \sqrt{E^2_e - m^2_e}/E_e$ is the electron velocity and $L(2\beta/(1+\beta))$ is the Spence function [19] (see also [3]). The constant $C_{WZ} = 10.249$ is caused by electroweak boson exchanges and QCD corrections [4–12] (see also Appendix D in Ref. [3]).

As has been pointed out in [20–22] (see also [3]), the contributions of interactions beyond the SM from the coupling constants a^h_{LL} and a^h_{LR} can be absorbed by a redefined axial coupling constant $\lambda_{\rm eff}$ and CKM matrix element $(V_{ud})_{\rm eff}$ [3], i.e.

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\lambda \to \lambda_{\rm eff} = \frac{\lambda - a^h_{LL} + a^h_{LR}}{1 + a^h_{LL} + a^h_{LR}},\\
&V_{ud} \to (V_{ud})_{\rm eff} = V_{ud}\,(1 + a^h_{LL} + a^h_{LR}).
\end{aligned}
\tag{4}
$$

As has been shown in [3] the axial coupling constant $\lambda_{\rm eff}$ is real at the level of order 10^{-4}. After such a redefinition the phenomenological coupling constants C_j and $\bar{C}_j$ for $j = V$, A, S and T become

$$
C_{V,{\rm eff}} = 1 + \frac{a^h_{RR} + a^h_{RL}}{1 + a^h_{LL} + a^h_{LR}} = 1 + \bar{a}^h_{RR} + \bar{a}^h_{RL},
$$

[1] With respect to the definition of the coupling constants in the original paper [17] we have extracted the common factor $G_F V_{ud}/\sqrt{2}$ and replaced a^h_{LL} and a^h_{LR} by $a^h_{LL} \to a^h_{LL} + (1-\lambda)/2$ and $a^h_{LR} \to a^h_{LR} + (1+\lambda)/2$, respectively, where the coupling constants a^h_{LL} and a^h_{LR} describe deviations from the coupling constants of the SM.

$$
\begin{aligned}
\bar{C}_{V,\text{eff}} &= -1 + \frac{a^h_{RR} + a^h_{RL}}{1 + a^h_{LL} + a^h_{LR}} = -1 + \bar{a}^h_{RR} + \bar{a}^h_{RL}, \\
C_{A,\text{eff}} &= -\lambda_{\text{eff}} + \frac{a^h_{RR} - a^h_{RL}}{1 + a^h_{LL} + a^h_{LR}} = -\lambda_{\text{eff}} + \bar{a}^h_{RR} - \bar{a}^h_{RL}, \\
\bar{C}_{A,\text{eff}} &= \lambda_{\text{eff}} + \frac{a^h_{RR} - a^h_{RL}}{1 + a^h_{LL} + a^h_{LR}} = \lambda_{\text{eff}} + \bar{a}^h_{RR} - \bar{a}^h_{RL}, \\
C_{S,\text{eff}} &= \frac{A^h_{LL} + A^h_{LR} + A^h_{RR} + A^h_{RL}}{1 + a^h_{LL} + a^h_{LR}} = \bar{A}^h_{LL} + \bar{A}^h_{LR} + \bar{A}^h_{RR} + \bar{A}^h_{RL}, \\
\bar{C}_{S,\text{eff}} &= \frac{-A^h_{LL} - A^h_{LR} + A^h_{RR} + A^h_{RL}}{1 + a^h_{LL} + a^h_{LR}} = -\bar{A}^h_{LL} - \bar{A}^h_{LR} + \bar{A}^h_{RR} + \bar{A}^h_{RL}, \\
C_{T,\text{eff}} &= 2\,\frac{\alpha^h_{LL} + \alpha^h_{RR}}{1 + a^h_{LL} + a^h_{LR}} = 2\,(\bar{\alpha}^h_{LL} + \bar{\alpha}^h_{RR}), \\
\bar{C}_{T,\text{eff}} &= 2\,\frac{-\alpha^h_{LL} + \alpha^h_{RR}}{1 + a^h_{LL} + a^h_{LR}} = 2\,(-\bar{\alpha}^h_{LL} + \bar{\alpha}^h_{RR}).
\end{aligned} \tag{5}
$$

Since the velocity of the electron in the hydrogen bound state with principal number n is equal to $\beta = \alpha/n$, we take the non-relativistic limit for the electron Dirac spinor in the calculation of the bound-state β^-–decay of the neutron.

II. BOUND–STATE β^-–DECAY OF NEUTRON AND LEFT–HANDED NEUTRINOS

For the calculation of the amplitude of the bound–state β^-–decay we use the following Dirac wave function for the antineutrino

$$
v_{\bar{\nu}_e} = \sqrt{E}\begin{pmatrix} (\vec{\sigma}\cdot\vec{n}\,)\chi_{\bar{\nu}_e} \\ \chi_{\bar{\nu}_e} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{6}
$$

where $\vec{n} = \vec{k}/E$ and normalisation equals $v^\dagger_{\bar{\nu}_e} v_{\bar{\nu}_e} = 2E$. For the right–handed polarisation states of antineutrinos, corresponding to the left–handed polarisation states of neutrinos, the Pauli wave function $\chi_{\bar{\nu}_e}$ obeys the equation $(\vec{\sigma}\cdot\vec{n}\,)\chi_{\bar{\nu}_e} = -\chi_{\bar{\nu}_e}$[2]. If the axis of the antineutrino–spin quantisation is inclined relative to the axis of the neutron–spin quantisation with a polar angle ϑ, the Pauli wave function $\chi_{\bar{\nu}_e}$ is given by [1]

$$
\chi_{\bar{\nu}_e} = \begin{pmatrix} -e^{\,-i\varphi}\sin\dfrac{\vartheta}{2} \\ \cos\dfrac{\vartheta}{2} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{7}
$$

where φ is an azimuthal angle. Keeping the leading order contributions in the α–expansion of the amplitude Eq. (1) and following [1], we obtain the amplitude of the transition $n \to \mathrm{H} + \bar{\nu}_e$,

[2] The Dirac wave function of antineutrinos in the right–handed polarisation state is equal to $u_{\bar{\nu}_e} = C\bar{v}^T_{\bar{\nu}_e}$ or $v_{\bar{\nu}_e} = C\bar{u}^T_{\bar{\nu}_e}$, where $C = i\gamma^0\gamma^2$ and T is a transposition [23]. The wave function $u_{\bar{\nu}_e} = C\bar{v}^T_{\bar{\nu}_e}$ is a column matrix function with elements $\sqrt{E}\,(\varphi_{\bar{\nu}_e}, (\vec{\sigma}\cdot\vec{n}\,)\varphi_{\bar{\nu}_e})$, where the Pauli spinor wave function $\varphi_{\bar{\nu}_e}$ is equal to $\varphi_{\bar{\nu}_e} = -i\sigma^2\chi^*_{\bar{\nu}_e}$ and obeys the equation $(\vec{\sigma}\cdot\vec{n}\,)\varphi_{\bar{\nu}_e} = +\varphi_{\bar{\nu}_e}$ [23].

where hydrogen is in the hyperfine $(ns)_F$ state with hyperfine spin F, in the form

$$M(n \to \mathrm{H} + \bar{\nu}_e)_{\rm rhps} = G_F(V_{ud})_{\rm eff}\sqrt{2m_n 2E_{\rm H} 2E}\,\Big(1 + \frac{\alpha}{2\pi}\,(f_{\beta_c^-} - 1)\Big)$$
$$\times\Big\{(1 + g_S)\,[\varphi_p^\dagger\varphi_n]\,[\varphi_e^\dagger\chi_{\bar{\nu}_e}] + (\lambda_{\rm eff} + g_T)\,[\varphi_p^\dagger\vec{\sigma}\,\varphi_n]\cdot[\varphi_e^\dagger\vec{\sigma}\,\chi_{\bar{\nu}_e}]\Big\}\,\psi^*_{(ns)_F}(0), \qquad (8)$$

where the abbreviation "rhps" means the *right–handed polarisation state*. Then, φ_j for $j = p, n, e$ and $\chi_{\bar{\nu}_e}$ are Pauli spinorial functions of the proton, neutron, electron and antineutrino, respectively. The term $(-\alpha/2\pi)$ is the contribution of those terms in Eq. (1), which are proportional to $(\alpha/2\pi)\,g_F(E_e)$. Furthermore, $(f_{\beta_c^-} - 1)$ and the effective coupling constants g_S and g_T are given by

$$f_{\beta_c^-} - 1 = \frac{3}{2}\,\ell n\Big(\frac{m_p}{m_e}\Big) - \frac{27}{8} + C_{WZ}, \qquad (9)$$

and

$$g_S \;=\; \frac{1}{2}\Big((C_{S,\rm eff} - \bar{C}_{S,\rm eff}) + (C_{V,\rm eff} - 1) - (\bar{C}_{V,\rm eff} + 1)\Big) = \bar{A}^h_{LL} + \bar{A}^h_{LR},$$
$$g_T \;=\; \frac{1}{2}\Big((C_{T,\rm eff} - \bar{C}_{T,\rm eff}) - (C_{A,\rm eff} + \lambda_{\rm eff}) + (\bar{C}_{A,\rm eff} - \lambda_{\rm eff})\Big) = 2\bar{\alpha}^h_{LL}. \qquad (10)$$

Note that the right–handed leptonic currents with the left- and right–handed hadronic currents do not contribute to the effective coupling constants g_S and g_T.

As has been shown in [3], the effective coupling constant $\lambda_{\rm eff}$ is real with an accuracy better than 10^{-4}. Following [1] and keeping only the linear terms in the expansion in powers of g_S and g_T we obtain the branching ratio of the bound-state β^-–decay of the neutron

$$R_{\beta_b^-} = \Big(1 + \frac{2}{1 + 3\lambda^2_{\rm eff}}\,{\rm Re}(g_S + 3\lambda_{\rm eff} g_T) - \Big\langle\frac{m_e}{E_e}\Big\rangle_{\rm SM} b_F\Big)\,R_{\rm SM}, \qquad (11)$$

where $\langle m_e/E_e\rangle_{\rm SM} = 0.6556$, averaged over the electron–energy density spectrum of the neutron β^-–decay [3]. The Fierz term b_F, defined to linear approximation with respect to the Herczeg coupling constants [3], is given by

$$b_F = \frac{1}{1 + 3\lambda^2_{\rm eff}}\,{\rm Re}\Big((C_{S,\rm eff} - \bar{C}_{S,\rm eff}) + 3\lambda_{\rm eff}(C_{T,\rm eff} - \bar{C}_{T,\rm eff})\Big) = \frac{2}{1 + 3\lambda^2_{\rm eff}}\,{\rm Re}\big(g_S + 3\lambda_{\rm eff} g_T\big) \qquad (12)$$

Hence, we may write the branching ratio R in the form

$$R_{\beta_b^-} = \Big(1 + \Big(1 - \Big\langle\frac{m_e}{E_e}\Big\rangle_{\rm SM}\Big)\,b_F\Big)\,R_{\rm SM}. \qquad (13)$$

As has been pointed out in [3], the Fierz term can be measured from the experimental data on the electron asymmetry $A_{\rm exp}(E_e)$ of correlations between the neutron spin and the electron 3–momentum and the proton–energy spectrum $a(T_p)$ (see also [24]), related to correlations between the 3–momenta of the proton and electron. The branching ratio $R_{\rm SM}$, calculated in the SM, is equal to

$$R_{\rm SM} = 2\pi\alpha^3\zeta(3)\,\Big(1 + \frac{\alpha}{\pi}\,(f_{\beta_c^-} - 1)\Big)\,\frac{m_p + m_e}{m_n}\,\frac{E^2}{m_e^2 f_n}\,\sqrt{1 + \frac{E^2}{(m_p + m_e)^2}} = 3.905\times 10^{-6}. \qquad (14)$$

where $\zeta(3) = 1.202$, $E = (m_n^2 - (m_p + m_e)^2)/2m_n = 0.782\,\mathrm{MeV}$ and $f_n = 1.755$ are the Riemann zeta function [19], the antineutrino energy and the phase–space factor of the neutron β^-–decay rate, including the contributions of the corrections, caused by the "weak magnetism" and the proton recoil as well as radiative corrections [3], respectively.

The contributions of different spinorial states to the helicity amplitudes of the bound-state β^-–decay as functions of the angles ϑ and φ are given in Table I.

σ_n	σ_p	σ_e	$\sigma_{\bar{\nu}_e}$	f
$+\frac{1}{2}$	$+\frac{1}{2}$	$-\frac{1}{2}$	$+\frac{1}{2}$	$(1 + g_S - \lambda_{\rm eff} - g_T)\,\cos\frac{\vartheta}{2}$
$+\frac{1}{2}$	$+\frac{1}{2}$	$+\frac{1}{2}$	$+\frac{1}{2}$	$-(1 + g_S + \lambda_{\rm eff} + g_T)\,e^{-i\varphi}\sin\frac{\vartheta}{2}$
$+\frac{1}{2}$	$-\frac{1}{2}$	$-\frac{1}{2}$	$+\frac{1}{2}$	0
$+\frac{1}{2}$	$-\frac{1}{2}$	$+\frac{1}{2}$	$+\frac{1}{2}$	$2(\lambda_{\rm eff} + g_T)\,\cos\frac{\vartheta}{2}$
$-\frac{1}{2}$	$+\frac{1}{2}$	$-\frac{1}{2}$	$+\frac{1}{2}$	$-2(\lambda_{\rm eff} + g_T)\,e^{-i\varphi}\sin\frac{\vartheta}{2}$
$-\frac{1}{2}$	$+\frac{1}{2}$	$+\frac{1}{2}$	$+\frac{1}{2}$	0
$-\frac{1}{2}$	$-\frac{1}{2}$	$-\frac{1}{2}$	$+\frac{1}{2}$	$(1 + g_S + \lambda_{\rm eff} + g_T)\,\cos\frac{\vartheta}{2}$
$-\frac{1}{2}$	$-\frac{1}{2}$	$+\frac{1}{2}$	$+\frac{1}{2}$	$-(1 + g_S - \lambda_{\rm eff} - g_T)\,e^{-i\varphi}\sin\frac{\vartheta}{2}$

TABLE I: The contributions of different spinorial states of the interacting particles to the amplitudes of the bound-state β^-–decay of the neutron and the antineutrino in the state with the wave function Eq. (7); f is defined by $f = (1 + g_S)[\varphi_e^\dagger\chi_{\bar{\nu}_e}][\varphi_p^\dagger\varphi_n] + (\lambda_{\rm eff} + g_T)[\varphi_e^\dagger\vec{\sigma}\,\chi_{\bar{\nu}_e}]\cdot[\varphi_p^\dagger\vec{\sigma}\,\varphi_n]$.

Following [1] we define the angular distributions of the production of hydrogen in the hyperfine states with $F = 0$ and $F = 1$ in the bound-state β^-–decay of the polarised neutron

$$4\pi\frac{dW^{(\pm)}_{F=0}(\theta)}{d\Omega} = \Big(\frac{1}{8}\,\frac{(1 - 3\lambda_{\rm eff})^2}{1 + 3\lambda^2_{\rm eff}} + \frac{3}{4}\frac{(1 + \lambda_{\rm eff})(1 - 3\lambda_{\rm eff})}{(1 + 3\lambda^2_{\rm eff})^2}\,{\rm Re}(\lambda_{\rm eff}\,g_S - g_T)\Big)\,(1 \mp \cos\theta),$$
$$4\pi\frac{dW^{(\pm)}_{F=1}(\theta)}{d\Omega} = \Big(\frac{3}{8}\,\frac{(1 + \lambda_{\rm eff})^2}{1 + 3\lambda^2_{\rm eff}} - \frac{3}{4}\frac{(1 + \lambda_{\rm eff})(1 - 3\lambda_{\rm eff})}{(1 + 3\lambda^2_{\rm eff})^2}\,{\rm Re}(\lambda_{\rm eff}\,g_S - g_T)\Big)\,\Big(1 \pm \frac{1}{3}\,\cos\theta\Big). \quad (15)$$

The upper indices $(\pm)$ in $W^{(\pm)}_F$ correspond to the neutron polarisation, $\theta = \pi - \vartheta$ is an angle between the neutron polarisation and the 3–momentum of hydrogen.

From Table I we define the angular distributions of the probabilities $W^{(\pm)}_1(\theta)$, $W^{(\pm)}_2(\theta)$, $W^{(\pm)}_3(\theta)$ and $W^{(\pm)}_4(\theta)$ of the neutron decay into the bound (pe^-) spinorial states $|+1/2\rangle_p|+1/2\rangle_e$, $|+1/2\rangle_p|-1/2\rangle_e$, $|-1/2\rangle_p|+1/2\rangle_e$ and $|-1/2\rangle_p|-1/2\rangle_e$ (see [25]), respectively. For the neutron spin polarisation $\sigma_n = +1/2$ the angular distributions of the probabilities $W^{(+)}_1(\theta)$, $W^{(+)}_2(\theta)$, $W^{(+)}_3(\theta)$ and $W^{(+)}_4(\theta)$ are equal to

$$4\pi\frac{dW^{(+)}_1(\theta)}{d\Omega} = \Big(\frac{1}{2}\,\frac{(1 + \lambda_{\rm eff})^2}{1 + 3\lambda^2_{\rm eff}} - \frac{(1 + \lambda_{\rm eff})(1 - 3\lambda_{\rm eff})}{(1 + 3\lambda^2_{\rm eff})^2}\,{\rm Re}(\lambda_{\rm eff}\,g_S - g_T)\Big)\,(1 + \cos\theta),$$
$$4\pi\frac{dW^{(+)}_2(\theta)}{d\Omega} = \Big(\frac{1}{2}\,\frac{(1 - \lambda_{\rm eff})^2}{1 + 3\lambda^2_{\rm eff}} + \frac{(1 - \lambda_{\rm eff})(1 + 3\lambda_{\rm eff})}{(1 + 3\lambda^2_{\rm eff})^2}\,{\rm Re}(\lambda_{\rm eff}\,g_S - g_T)\Big)\,(1 - \cos\theta),$$
$$4\pi\frac{dW^{(+)}_3(\theta)}{d\Omega} = \Big(\frac{2\lambda^2_{\rm eff}}{1 + 3\lambda^2_{\rm eff}} - \frac{4\lambda_{\rm eff}}{(1 + 3\lambda^2_{\rm eff})^2}\,{\rm Re}(\lambda_{\rm eff}\,g_S - g_T)\Big)\,(1 - \cos\theta),$$

$$4\pi\frac{dW_4^{(+)}(\theta)}{d\Omega} = 0. \tag{16}$$

For the neutron spin polarisation $\sigma_n = -1/2$ the angular distributions of the probabilities $W_1^{(-)}(\theta)$, $W_2^{(-)}(\theta)$, $W_3^{(-)}(\theta)$ and $W_4^{(-)}(\theta)$ are

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{dW_1^{(-)}(\theta)}{d\Omega} &= \frac{dW_4^{(+)}(\pi-\theta)}{d\Omega},\\
\frac{dW_2^{(-)}(\theta)}{d\Omega} &= \frac{dW_3^{(+)}(\pi-\theta)}{d\Omega},\\
\frac{dW_3^{(-)}(\theta)}{d\Omega} &= \frac{dW_2^{(+)}(\pi-\theta)}{d\Omega},\\
\frac{dW_4^{(-)}(\theta)}{d\Omega} &= \frac{dW_1^{(+)}(\pi-\theta)}{d\Omega}.
\end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

In comparison with [1] we have expanded the angular distributions in powers of the Fierz term b_F and have kept only the linear contributions. As result, we have obtained that the bound–state β^-–decay of a free neutron is sensitive to the effective coupling constant $\mathrm{Re}(\lambda_{\mathrm{eff}}\, g_S - g_T)$ only, which contains no information about the right–handed leptonic currents.

III. BOUND–STATE β^-–DECAY OF NEUTRON AND RIGHT–HANDED NEUTRINOS

The absence of contributions of right–handed leptonic currents in the probabilities of the bound–state β^-–decay, calculated in section II, is not a surprise, because we have used there the wave functions of antineutrinos in the right–handed polarisation state, corresponding to the left–handed polarisation state of neutrinos. Being multiplied by the projection operator $P_R = (1+\gamma^5)/2$, appearing in the right–handed leptonic currents, the wave function of antineutrinos $v_{\bar\nu_e}$ in the right–handed polarisation state with $(\vec\sigma\cdot\vec n\,)\chi_{\bar\nu_e} = -\chi_{\bar\nu_e}$ gives a vanishing contribution, i.e. $P_R v_{\bar\nu_e} = 0$.

In this section, we assume that antineutrinos can have also left–handed polarisation state that is possible if antineutrinos (neutrinos) are massive. According to [18], a mass of the electron neutrino (antineutrino) should not exceed a few eV. Since in the bound–state β^-–decay $E = Q_{\beta^-_c} = 0.782\,\mathrm{MeV}$ [1], one can neglect the antineutrino mass with respect to the antineutrino energy E and use the Dirac wave function Eq. (6). However, the Pauli wave function $\chi_{\bar\nu_e}$ of antineutrinos in the left–handed polarisation state should obey the equation $(\vec\sigma\cdot\vec n\,)\chi_{\bar\nu_e} = +\chi_{\bar\nu_e}$[3]. If the axis of the antineutrino–spin quantisation is inclined relative to the axis of the neutron–spin quantisation with a polar angle ϑ, the Pauli wave function $\chi_{\bar\nu_e}$ is given by

$$\chi_{\bar\nu_e} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos\dfrac{\vartheta}{2} \\ e^{+i\varphi}\sin\dfrac{\vartheta}{2} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{18}$$

[3] The Dirac wave function of antineutrinos in the left–handed polarisation state is equal to $u_{\bar\nu_e} = C\bar v^T_{\bar\nu_e}$, where the Pauli spinor wave function $\varphi_{\bar\nu_e} = -i\sigma^2\chi^*_{\bar\nu_e}$ obeys the equation $(\vec\sigma\cdot\vec n\,)\varphi_{\bar\nu_e} = -\varphi_{\bar\nu_e}$ [23].

The amplitude of the bound–state β^-–decay of the neutron with antineutrinos in the left–handed polarisation state is given by

$$M(n \to {\rm H} + \bar{\nu}_e)_{\rm lhps} = G_F (V_{ud})_{\rm eff} \sqrt{2 m_n 2 E_{\rm H} 2E} \left(1 + \frac{\alpha}{2\pi}\,(f_{\beta_c^-} - 1)\right)$$
$$\times \Big\{ \bar{g}_S\,[\varphi_p^\dagger \varphi_n]\,[\varphi_e^\dagger \chi_{\bar{\nu}_e}] + \bar{g}_T\,[\varphi_p^\dagger \vec{\sigma}\,\varphi_n] \cdot [\varphi_e^\dagger \vec{\sigma}\,\chi_{\bar{\nu}_e}] \Big\}\,\psi^*_{(ns)_F}(0), \qquad (19)$$

where the abbreviation "lhps" means the *left–handed polarisation state*. The coupling constants $\bar{g}_S$ and $\bar{g}_T$ are equal to

$$\bar{g}_S \;=\; \frac{1}{2}\Big((C_{S,\rm eff} + \bar{C}_{S,\rm eff}) + (C_{V,\rm eff} + \bar{C}_{V,\rm eff})\Big) = \bar{A}^h_{RR} + \bar{A}^h_{RL} + \bar{a}^h_{RR} + \bar{a}^h_{RL},$$
$$\bar{g}_T \;=\; \frac{1}{2}\Big((C_{T,\rm eff} + \bar{C}_{T,\rm eff}) - (C_{A,\rm eff} + \bar{C}_{A,\rm eff})\Big) = 2\bar{\alpha}^h_{RR} - \bar{a}^h_{RR} + \bar{a}^h_{RL}. \qquad (20)$$

One may see that the coupling constants $\bar{g}_S$ and $\bar{g}_T$ are defined in terms of the contributions of the right–handed leptonic currents and left(right)–handed hadronic currents only. For the calculation of the amplitude Eq. (20) we have neglected contributions of order $(\alpha/2\pi)^2 \sim 10^{-6}$, $(\alpha/2\pi)\bar{g}_S$ and $(\alpha/2\pi)\bar{g}_T$. The coupling constants $\bar{a}^h_{RR}$ and $\bar{a}^h_{RL}$ can in principle be induced by exchanges of electroweak $W^\pm_R$–bosons, causing effective low–energy current–current interactions $(V+A)_{\rm leptonic}(V+A)_{\rm hadronic}$ and $(V+A)_{\rm leptonic}(V-A)_{\rm hadronic}$ [26–28]. Of course, the contributions of these interactions can be screened by scalar and tensor interactions with coupling constants $\bar{A}^h_{RR}$, $\bar{A}^h_{RL}$ and $2\bar{\alpha}^h_{RR}$.

The contributions of different spinorial states to the helicity amplitudes of the bound–state β^-–decay of the neutron with the antineutrino in the left–handed polarisation state as functions of the angles ϑ and φ are given in Table II.

σ_n	σ_p	σ_e	$\sigma_{\bar{\nu}_e}$	f
$+\frac{1}{2}$	$+\frac{1}{2}$	$-\frac{1}{2}$	$-\frac{1}{2}$	$(\bar{g}_S - \bar{g}_T)\sin\frac{\vartheta}{2}\,e^{\,i\varphi}$
$+\frac{1}{2}$	$+\frac{1}{2}$	$+\frac{1}{2}$	$-\frac{1}{2}$	$(\bar{g}_S + \bar{g}_T)\cos\frac{\vartheta}{2}$
$+\frac{1}{2}$	$-\frac{1}{2}$	$-\frac{1}{2}$	$-\frac{1}{2}$	0
$+\frac{1}{2}$	$-\frac{1}{2}$	$+\frac{1}{2}$	$-\frac{1}{2}$	$2\bar{g}_T\sin\frac{\vartheta}{2}\,e^{i\varphi}$
$-\frac{1}{2}$	$+\frac{1}{2}$	$-\frac{1}{2}$	$-\frac{1}{2}$	$2\bar{g}_T\cos\frac{\vartheta}{2}$
$-\frac{1}{2}$	$+\frac{1}{2}$	$+\frac{1}{2}$	$-\frac{1}{2}$	0
$-\frac{1}{2}$	$-\frac{1}{2}$	$-\frac{1}{2}$	$-\frac{1}{2}$	$(\bar{g}_S + \bar{g}_T)\sin\frac{\vartheta}{2}\,e^{\,i\varphi}$
$-\frac{1}{2}$	$-\frac{1}{2}$	$+\frac{1}{2}$	$-\frac{1}{2}$	$(\bar{g}_S - \bar{g}_T)\cos\frac{\vartheta}{2}$

TABLE II: The contributions of different spinorial states of the interacting particles to the amplitudes of the bound-state β^-–decay of the neutron and the antineutrino in the state with the wave function Eq. (19); f is defined by $f = \bar{g}_S\,[\varphi_e^\dagger \chi_{\bar{\nu}_e}][\varphi_p^\dagger \varphi_n] + \bar{g}_T\,[\varphi_e^\dagger \vec{\sigma}\,\chi_{\bar{\nu}_e}] \cdot [\varphi_p^\dagger \vec{\sigma}\,\varphi_n]$.

Since the contributions of the left–handed polarisation state of antineutrinos to the angular distributions $dW_F^{(\pm)}(\theta)/d\Omega$ for $F = 0, 1$ are of order $\bar{g}_S^2$, $\bar{g}_T^2$, $\bar{g}_S\bar{g}_T$ and can be screened by the contributions of the right–handed polarisation state of antineutrinos, we may neglect them. However, the angular distributions of the probabilities $W_1^{(\pm)}(\theta)$, $W_2^{(\pm)}(\theta)$, $W_3^{(\pm)}(\theta)$ and $W_4^{(\pm)}(\theta)$ may be meaningful if the corresponding angular distributions, caused by the

right–handed polarisation state of antineutrinos, vanish. From Table II we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
4\pi\frac{dW_1^{(+)}(\theta)}{d\Omega} &= \frac{1}{2}\,\frac{|\bar{g}_S+\bar{g}_T|^2}{1+3\lambda_{\rm eff}^2}\,(1-\cos\theta),\\
4\pi\frac{dW_2^{(+)}(\theta)}{d\Omega} &= \frac{1}{2}\,\frac{|\bar{g}_S-\bar{g}_T|^2}{1+3\lambda_{\rm eff}^2}\,(1+\cos\theta),\\
4\pi\frac{dW_3^{(+)}(\theta)}{d\Omega} &= \frac{2|\bar{g}_T|^2}{1+3\lambda_{\rm eff}^2}\,(1+\cos\theta),\\
4\pi\frac{dW_4^{(+)}(\theta)}{d\Omega} &= 0,
\end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{dW_1^{(-)}(\theta)}{d\Omega} &= \frac{dW_4^{(+)}(\pi-\theta)}{d\Omega},\\
\frac{dW_2^{(-)}(\theta)}{d\Omega} &= \frac{dW_3^{(+)}(\pi-\theta)}{d\Omega},\\
\frac{dW_3^{(-)}(\theta)}{d\Omega} &= \frac{dW_2^{(+)}(\pi-\theta)}{d\Omega},\\
\frac{dW_4^{(-)}(\theta)}{d\Omega} &= \frac{dW_1^{(+)}(\pi-\theta)}{d\Omega}.
\end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

The contributions of the left–handed polarisation state of the electron antineutrino are of the second order in comparison with the contributions of the right–handed polarisation state. This implies that the contributions of the left–handed polarisation state can be fully screened by the contributions of the right–handed one.

IV. CONCLUSION

We have revised the bound-state β^-–decay of the free neutron. For the calculation of the branching ratio we have taken into account the contribution of radiative corrections and analysed the dependence of the probabilities of the bound-state β^-–decay on phenomenological coupling constants [13–15, 17], describing the most general weak effective lepton–nucleon interactions. We have found that to linear approximation with respect to Herczeg's phenomenological coupling constants, introduced at the hadronic level [3], these probabilities depend only on the effective coupling constant $\mathrm{Re}(\lambda_{\rm eff}g_S - g_T)$, which carries no information above weak interactions, caused by exchanges of electroweak bosons coupled to right–handed leptonic and hadronic currents. This implies that the bound-state β^-–decay is not a good laboratory for experimental investigations of electroweak models with left–right symmetries, as has previously been argued [25].

V. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This work was supported by the Austrian "Fonds zur Förderung der Wissenschaftlichen Forschung" (FWF) under the contracts I689-N16, I534-N20 PERC and I862-N20 and by the

Russian Foundation for Basic Research under the contract No. 11-02-91000 -ANF_a.

---

[1] M. Faber *et al.*, Phys.Rev. **C80**, 035503 (2009), 0906.0959.
[2] H. Abele, Prog.Part.Nucl.Phys. **60**, 1 (2008).
[3] A. Ivanov, M. Pitschmann, and N. Troitskaya, Phys.Rev. **D88**, 073002 (2013), 1212.0332.
[4] A. Sirlin, Phys.Rev. **164**, 1767 (1967).
[5] A. Sirlin, Nucl.Phys. **B71**, 29 (1974).
[6] W. Marciano and A. Sirlin, Nucl.Phys. **B88**, 86 (1975).
[7] A. Sirlin, Rev.Mod.Phys. **50**, 573 (1978).
[8] A. Sirlin, Nucl.Phys. **B196**, 83 (1982).
[9] W. Marciano and A. Sirlin, Phys.Rev.Lett. **56**, 22 (1986).
[10] A. Czarnecki, W. J. Marciano, and A. Sirlin, Phys.Rev. **D70**, 093006 (2004), hep-ph/0406324.
[11] W. J. Marciano and A. Sirlin, Phys.Rev.Lett. **96**, 032002 (2006), hep-ph/0510099.
[12] A. Czarnecki, W. J. Marciano, and A. Sirlin, Phys.Rev.Lett. **99**, 032003 (2007), 0704.3968.
[13] J. Jackson, S. Treiman, and H. Wyld, Phys.Rev. **106**, 517 (1957).
[14] J. Jackson, S. Treiman, and H. W. Jr., Nuclear Physics **4**, 206 (1957).
[15] N. Severijns, M. Beck, and O. Naviliat-Cuncic, Rev.Mod.Phys. **78**, 991 (2006), nucl-ex/0605029.
[16] M. Ramsey-Musolf and S. Su, Phys.Rept. **456**, 1 (2008), hep-ph/0612057.
[17] P. Herczeg, Prog.Part.Nucl.Phys. **46**, 413 (2001).
[18] Particle Data Group, J. Beringer *et al.*, Phys.Rev. **D86**, 010001 (2012).
[19] M. Abramowitz and I. A. Stegun, *Handbook of Mathematical Functions with Formulas, Graphs, and Mathematical Tables*, Tenth printing with corrections ed. (National Bureau of Standards Applied Mathematics Series 55, New York, 1972).
[20] T. Bhattacharya *et al.*, Phys.Rev. **D85**, 054512 (2012), 1110.6448.
[21] V. Cirigliano, J. Jenkins, and M. Gonzalez-Alonso, Nucl.Phys. **B830**, 95 (2010), 0908.1754.
[22] V. Cirigliano, M. Gonzalez-Alonso, and M. L. Graesser, JHEP **1302**, 046 (2013), 1210.4553.
[23] C. Itzykson and J. Zuber, in *Quantum Field Theory*, McGraw–Hill Inc., New York, (1980).
[24] A. Ivanov, R. Hollwieser, N. Troitskaya, and M. Wellenzohn, Phys.Rev. **D88**, 065026 (2013), 1306.4448.
[25] J. Byrne, Europhys.Lett. **56**, 633 (2001).
[26] M. Beg, R. Budny, R. N. Mohapatra, and A. Sirlin, Phys.Rev.Lett. **38**, 1252 (1977).
[27] B. R. Holstein and S. Treiman, Phys.Rev. **D16**, 2369 (1977).
[28] A. Carnoy, J. Deutsch, and B. R. Holstein, Phys.Rev. **D38**, 1636 (1988).